717-B-13

J1.87: 982

DEC 6 1985

U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20531

(serial)

Third Annual Report of the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies

COMPLETED

Bureau of Justice Statistics

National Institute of Justice

Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Third Annual Report of the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies

Fiscal Year 1982

Bureau of Justice Statistics

National Institute of Justice

Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20531

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We have the honor to transmit herewith the Third Annual Report of the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies, that is, the Bureau of Justice Statistics; the National Institute of Justice; the Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics; and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. This report describes their programs and activities during fiscal year 1982.

The Justice System Improvement Act (Public Law 96-157), which took effect on December 27, 1979, restructured the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and created four independent Agencies within the Department of Justice under the authority of the Attorney General to help State and local governments improve the administration of their criminal justice systems, to conduct research in criminal justice, and to compile and disseminate criminal justice statistics. LEAA was terminated on April 15, 1982, after not having received any appropriations since fiscal year 1980.

On December 8, 1980, the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980 (Public Law 96-509) took effect. The statute amended the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 by taking the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention out of LEAA, making it an independent Agency within the Department, and extending its authority through fiscal year 1984. The two statutes significantly improved the manner in which the Federal Government provides financial and technical aid to State, county, and municipal criminal justice systems.

Lois H. Herrington
Acting Director
Office of Justice
Assistance, Research,
and Statistics

Steven R. Schlesinger
Director
Bureau of Justice
Statistics

James K. Stewart
Director
National Institute of Justice

Alfred S. Regnery
Administrator-Designate
Office of Juvenile
Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Legislation 1

Budget 2

Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics 3

- Office of General Counsel 3
- Office of Civil Rights Compliance 3
- Office of Public Information 4
- Office of Equal Employment Opportunity 4
- Office of Planning and Management 4
- Office of the Comptroller 4
- Office of Operations Support 5
- Office of Congressional Liaison 5
- Office of Public Safety Officers' Benefits 5

National Institute of Justice 6

Bureau of Justice Statistics 10

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention 13

Appendix 17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The first substantial Federal aid to State and local criminal justice systems was made possible through the creation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in 1968. LEAA had a research program and a criminal justice information and statistics service, which are now operated by the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Beginning in 1974, LEAA operated the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, which provided State and local grants and coordinated programs for juveniles throughout the Federal Government.

The President and the Congress agreed to end the LEAA grant program to the States and localities beginning in fiscal year 1981. On April 15, 1982, LEAA was terminated.

The National Institute of Justice conducts research to increase knowledge about criminal behavior and criminal justice operations, and it evaluates the effectiveness of various kinds of criminal justice programs.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics develops statistics about crime victims, offenders, and criminal justice operations.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention administers a broad range of programs to assist State and local governments help young people. Its National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention conducts research to determine the most effective ways with which to prevent delinquency and to help youths lead more productive lives.

The Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics coordinates the activities of and provides staff support to the National Institute of Justice, the Bureau of Justics Statistics, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

The Legislation

The Justice System Improvement Act (Public Law 96-157) took effect on December 27, 1979. It reorganized and restructured the program as originally established under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-351). The 1979 legislation created three new agencies, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics (OJARS). The latter agency's purpose was to coordinate the activities of the other agencies and to provide staff support. In addition, OJARS administers the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-503). This legislation provides a $50,000 benefit to the survivors of public safety officers (including firefighters) killed as the result of personal injury sustained in the line of duty.

On December 8, 1980, the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-509) were enacted. They created the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (which theretofore had been a part of LEAA) as an autonomous agency within the U.S. Department of Justice and continued the program created in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415), authorizing it through fiscal year 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Budget

The total budget for the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies for fiscal year 1982 was $128.6 mil[illegible] The individual appropriations for 1982 (in thousands of dollars) were as follows:

Juvenile justice formula grants	$43,095
Criminal justice formula grants (Part D)	--
Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (Part E)	3,800
General criminal justice grants program (Part F)	--
Training:	
Educational development	--
Prosecutor training	--
General criminal justice training	--
Subtotal, Training	--
Crime prevention programs	--
Juvenile justice programs:	
Special emphasis	14,365
Juvenile justice institute	7,436
Technical assistance	2,028
Concentration of Federal efforts	676
Subtotal, Juvenile justice programs	24,505
Public Safety Officers' Benefits program	10,131
Executive direction and control, OJJDP	2,400
Administrative services, OJARS/LEAA	9,623
Executive direction and control, LEAA	
Subtotal, Law Enforcement Assistance Appropriation	93,554
Research, evaluation, and demonstration programs	16,767
Justice statistical programs	13,875
Executive direction and control, NIJ	2,908
Executive direction and control, BJS	1,450
Subtotal, Research and Statistics Appropriation	35,000
Total	**$128,554**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics

The Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics (OJARS) coordinates the activities of and provides staff support to all the agencies authorized under the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979.

During fiscal year 1982, OJARS implemented the phase-out plan for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The plan brought to an end the State and local assistance programs of LEAA and transferred to OJARS the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program and the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime program, as well as several other criminal justice improvement efforts that continue. The termination of LEAA created the need for a reduction-in-force that produced the separation of 36 employees and the downgrading of 18 others.

Throughout the year, OJARS continued its cooperative campaign with the National Advertising Council to help prevent crime in America. Through a coalition of Federal and State agencies and national nonprofit organizations, citizens were urged to initiate new crime prevention programs or enhance existing ones, emphasizing that crime can be prevented through citizen action. To assure the continuing success of the campaign—which has received some $100 million in donated public service advertising space and time—OJARS entered into a cooperative agreement with the National Crime Prevention Council to manage the campaign through fiscal year 1984.

OJARS developed a reauthorization proposal for the Justice System Improvement Act, and it was presented to the Congress in June 1982. The proposed legislation would continue the programs of the National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics and would create a small Office of Justice Research and Statistics headed by an Assistant Attorney General and responsible for supporting and coordinating the activities of the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Significant 1982 accomplishments at OJARS also included the resolution of all but 15 docketed civil rights compliance cases—closing 55 complaints, the final close-out of 215 block and 650 categorical grants, and the review of some 350 final grant audits by the Audit Review Committee.

Office of General Counsel

The Office of General Counsel provides legal advice to the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies and to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Office represents these agencies in administrative hearings, including, during the past year, grant denial hearings, Merit System Protection Board hearings, civil rights compliance appeals, and grievance arbitrations. The Office also plays a substantial role in the defense of lawsuits affecting the agencies. During the past year, litigation included suits challenging the reduction-in-force (RIF) conducted in the agencies, several appeals of benefit denials under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act, and an equal employment opportunity case.

Cases of particular note included *Andrade* v. *Lauer*, an action brought by 28 Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention employees contending that the RIF had a disruptive impact on their agency's operations. The U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C., dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. It is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. In a related case, *Martin* v. *Lauer*, the Court of Appeals permitted the Agency to compel employees to disclose to the Agency written information and documents that they had provided to their counsel that could be subject to the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act.

The U.S. Court of Claims upheld the Agency's position in several cases arising under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act, including two controversial heart attack deaths (*North* v. *U.S.* and *Russell* v. *U.S.*).

In administrative actions, the Agency reached a settlement with the Massachusetts Department of Correction under which that department agreed to improve living conditions for handicapped inmates confined in the State's penal institutions.

During the year, the Office published "Legal Interpretations of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act," an index to the legal opinions, claim determinations, and court decisions made under the Act since its inception in 1976. The Office also assisted in promulgating the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's "valid court order" regulations, which described the circumstances under which judges could incarcerate adjudicated juvenile status offenders for violations of court orders.

The Office also advises officials on legal questions arising from grants, contracts, and the statutes and regulations governing the expenditure of Federal funds. In addition, it is responsible for drafting Agency regulations and reviewing audit findings. It played an important role in the phaseout of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and its programs over the past two years.

Office of Civil Rights Compliance

The Office of Civil Rights Compliance monitors compliance with the civil rights responsibilities of the recipients of criminal justice system financial assistance under the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979 and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This includes enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 815(c) of the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, and the Department of Justice regulations promulgated for the implementation of these statutes (28 CFR Part 42). Although no post-award compliance reviews were conducted during the year, two resolution agreements were negotiated and executed that were the result of previously conducted compliance reviews.

Three notices of noncompliance were issued that warned

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of possible fund suspensions if compliance was not secured. Fund suspension was imposed in two cases, but funding continued after resolutions of the noncompliance.

During the year 55 complaint investigations were completed. A total of 3.75 workyears was contributed by professionals in this effort. As a result, the inventory of cases decreased from 58 at the beginning of the year to 15 at the end of the year. Although 157 allegations of civil rights noncompliance were received during the year, only 12 were docketed for investigation, primarily because of the lack of LEAA or other JSIA funding to the cited respondents.

Office of Public Information

The Office of Public Information is responsible for keeping the news media and the general public fully informed about JSIA Agency activities. It responds to questions and prepares news announcements and feature stories about all programs of general and special interest.

The Office arranges news conferences and briefings to explain the details of significant research findings, statistical reports, and important new program initiatives. It also prepares speeches, briefing papers, and policy statements for JSIA Agency administrators and directors.

As the Freedom of Information Act Office, it encourages the widest possible dissemination of information consistent with the law. During fiscal year 1981, the Office responded to 428 Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act requests.

The Office publishes a newsletter, *Justice Assistance News*, which is distributed ten times a year.

During the past year the Office issued 42 news features on matters of national interest and 49 news releases of regional interest.

Office of Equal Employment Opportunity

The Office of Equal Employment Opportunity evaluates the JSIA Agencies' personnel management policies, practices, and programs for their impact on equal employment opportunity and the development and implementation of the Agencies' Annual Affirmative Action Plan. It processes informal and formal EEO complaints of discrimination and implements the required Special Emphasis Programs.

Fiscal year 1982 activities included:

- The JSIA Agencies participated in four major national conferences on civil rights and equal opportunity for minorities and women.
- The Office collected additional data concerning equal opportunity. In addition, quarterly statistical reports on female and minority employment in relation to the Agency's goals were analyzed.
- Heritage Week activities for blacks, Hispanics, women, and Asian/Pacific Americans included a wide range of activities during each special week, i.e., educational workshops, films, displays, and receptions with ethnic displays.

Office of Planning and Management

The Office of Planning and Management provides general policy direction and support for OJARS' planning, management, and evaluation activities. It facilitates the coordination of these activities with NIJ, BJS, and OJJDP by developing and providing information on management and program topics of mutual interest. The Office is the principal advisor to the Director of OJARS on issues that cut across the JSIA Agencies. The Office was also responsible for coordinating the phase-out of the LEAA program, which was officially terminated in April 1982, and managing a small number of criminal justice improvement programs that continue.

Among its significant activities in fiscal year 1982, the Office of Planning and Management:

- Prepared the LEAA Phase-out Plan, dated January 22, 1982, and chaired the Phase-out Task Force, which monitors the phase-out of the LEAA program and conducts contingency planning for anticipated personnel and budget reductions.
- Managed the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign in partnership with the Advertising Council and helped establish the National Crime Prevention Council.
- Managed the OJARS Victim Assistance Program.
- Revised OJARS' audit resolution policy and procedures, coordinated activities of the OJARS Audit Review Committee, and oversaw the development of an automated audit tracking system.
- Managed grants to the National Criminal Justice Association, the National Governor's Association, and the National Association of Criminal Justice Planners to encourage the institutionalization of criminal justice system planning within the States and also to help assure the responsible termination of the State block grant component of the former LEAA program.
- Provided liaison for the JSIA Agencies with the General Accounting Office.
- Managed a number of ongoing programs, including the Regional Information Sharing System program, the Law Enforcement Accreditation program, the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) program, and the Prison Industries Enhancement program.
- Managed phase-out activities for the "Sting" Anti-Fencing program and the Integrated Criminal Apprehension Program (ICAP).
- Participated in and provided support for the Intelligence Systems Policy Review Board.

Office of the Comptroller

The Office of the Comptroller is the principal advisor to the Director of OJARS on resource management, information systems, and internal controls. It also is responsible for planning, developing, and improving financial management programs; for upgrading Federal and State financial and grants management systems; for providing policy guidance, controls, and support services for the JSIA Agencies in the areas of accounting, budgeting, grant management, procurement, claims collection and settle-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ment, internal and external administrative automated data processing (including hardware and system development, financial management, budgeting, accounting, management information, and other administrative information systems); for administering the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program; for terminating the LEAA grant program; and for providing technical assistance and training to the other JSIA offices, to the Criminal Justice Councils, and to other grantees in the area of financial management. It also coordinates the JSIA Agencies' compliance with financial and grants management regulations and directives. The Office has six divisions: the Information Systems Division, the Accounting Division, the Budget Division, the Financial and Grants Management Division, the Contracts Division, the Program Services Division, and the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Division.

When the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was terminated in April, 1982, the responsibility for closing out the program was transferred to this Office. A separate division was created to monitor and bring to a close all remaining LEAA grants. In addition, a task force was set up within the Office to reconcile the accounting records (including the letters of credit) for the Criminal Justice Councils and all LEAA grantees. The Office is emphasizing improvements in management and efficiency to allow it to proceed with the orderly closeout of the LEAA program while providing support services to the ongoing JSIA components without interruption.

Office of Operations Support

The Office of Operations Support is responsible for directing and coordinating all activities concerning the internal and organizational support of OJARS and the other JSIA Agencies.

The Personnel Division provides employee services to all components of the Agencies. This includes the recruitment, selection, and placement of all employees. It also represents management in all labor-relations matters. A major activity during the year was the conducting of a major reduction-in-force as a result of the abolishment of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This resulted in the separation of 36 employees and the downgrading of 18 other employees. An Outplacement Task Force consisting of JSIA staff and a representative of the Justice Management Division in the Department of Justice was formed to assist separated employees in finding new employment. The personnel strength declined from 317 at the end of the fiscal year 1981 to 281 positions at the end of fiscal year 1982.

The Administrative Services Division is responsible for the management and provision of security, furnishings, telephone systems, equipment, maintenance, office space, mail services, and safety and health programs. In addition, it assists grantees in obtaining Federal excess personal property. During fiscal year 1982, grantees obtained property originally costing $360,523 at a cost of $96,295.

The Management Support Division is responsible for the JSIA Agencies' directives systems, records management, correspondence, files and forms management, management analysis services, graphic support, and printing and publications support services.

Office of Congressional Liaison

The Office of Congressional Liaison is responsible for maintaining effective communications with the Congress, for developing legislative proposals to implement Administration goals, and for providing general guidance in intergovernmental affairs.

The Office performs liaison activities with congressional leaders, committees, and with the individual members of the Congress on legislative matters affecting the JSIA Agencies and the criminal justice community. It is responsible for the review of pending legislation affecting criminal justice, for the drafting of JSIA reauthorization legislation and for the preparation of statements and background material for officials of the Department testifying at congressional hearings.

It retains a close working relationship with significant national organizations interested in the criminal justice system, particularly concerning mutual legislative interests.

Office of Public Safety Officers' Benefits

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act of 1976 authorizes the Department of Justice to pay a benefit of $50,000 to the eligible survivors of State and local public safety officers who die as the result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty.

Public safety officer is defined as "a person serving a public agency at the State and local level in an official capacity, with or without compensation, as a law enforcement officer or as a firefighter." Among those for whom coverage is intended are persons involved in crime and juvenile delinquency control or reduction, or the enforcement of the criminal laws, including police, corrections, probation, parole, and judicial officers. Paid and volunteer firefighters are also covered.

The Act applies to deaths occurring from injuries sustained on or after September 29, 1976.

During fiscal year 1982, there were 302 claims filed under the Act. During the same time, 216 claims were determined to be eligible and 81 ineligible. This resulted in benefit payments of $10.8 million.

By the end of fiscal year 1982, 1,840 claims had been adjudicated under the Act. Line of duty death data is extracted from these claims and stored in an automated data base. This data base was created to assist research efforts into the cause and prevention of line of duty deaths. Data is now available from local, State, and Federal public safety agencies upon request from universities, public safety associations, unions, and others interested in preventing line of duty deaths.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) sponsors research and development to learn more about crime, its causes, and how criminal justice agencies can better control it.

Among the highlights of Institute research during 1982:

- The results of career criminal research provided an improved means for identifying the relatively small number of offenders who commit an exceedingly large number of violent offenses. The studies provided a profile of the types and volume of crime committed by the most criminally active offenders and a range of offender characteristics that could—when refined— help determine which defendants should receive longer sentences.
- Researchers probed the nature and patterns of specific violent crimes, such as robbery and homicide, the relationship of weapons and violent crime, and the impact of programs targeted on violent offenders.
- Training for law enforcement officials presented approaches for realigning police operations while reserving resources for the most serious crimes. The workshops emphasized alternative approaches to the efficient delivery of police services that would also permit increased efforts to combat violent crimes.
- Studies examining issues addressed by the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime gathered reliable new information about victim services, the role of victims in the criminal justice system, victim compensation, and crime prevention in the schools.

Organization

The Institute is divided into four offices, reflecting the basic functions assigned to it by Congress in the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979. The Office of Research Programs supports a broad range of research activities to help strengthen criminal justice operations and formulate policies for crime prevention and control and a better understanding of criminal patterns and behavior. The Office of Research and Evaluation Methods supports research on prediction and classification techniques, analyses of crime control policies, and the development of performance standards for criminal justice agencies. The Office of Program Evaluation sponsors assessments of criminal justice programs and procedures. And the Office of Development, Testing, and Dissemination translates the results of research and evaluation into operating techniques, tests promising new criminal justice programs and transfers information through training and dissemination to State and local officials. Overall direction and policy guidance is presented by the Institute's Director who is appointed by the President. A presidentially-appointed Advisory Board assists the Director by recommending policies and priorities and advising on peer review procedures.

Career Criminals

Research on the career criminal is an Institute priority. It attempts to increase knowledge about repeat offenders and policies for controlling habitual criminals.

In 1982 the National Institute announced the results of a six-year research project on career criminals conducted by the Rand Corporation. The most recent studies in this long-term effort confirmed earlier research showing that a relatively small percentage of felons commit a disproportionately large number of serious crimes. The typical violent offender who poses the greatest threat to society is an individual who commits a combination of serious offenses, including robbery, assault, and drug violations. This profile of crime types, which distinguishes the criminal activity of the "violent predator," was drawn from interviews with nearly 2,200 inmates in Texas, California, and Michigan and from analyses of criminal histories.

The researchers found that the most active violent predators commit hundreds of serious crimes a year. For example, the 10 percent of the sample with the highest robbery rates committed more than 135 robberies a year. And the same percentage of the sample with the highest burglary rates committed more than 500 burglaries a year. Drug crimes by the 10 percent of the sample with the highest drug-dealing rates averaged more than 4,000 drug deals a year.

The study also corroborated the link between drug use and serious crime. California inmates who were heroin addicts reported committing an average of 34 robberies, 68 burglaries, and 22 thefts per year. By contrast, inmates reporting no drug use said they committed an average of two robberies, three burglaries, and eight thefts per year. Multiple drug use was a distinguishing characteristic of the serious offenders: typically heroin with barbiturates, barbiturates with alcohol, and amphetamines with alcohol, among other combinations.

In addition to drug usage, levels of criminal activity, and types of crimes, other characteristics set serious offenders apart from their less violent counterparts. The career offender usually begins committing crimes, particularly violent crimes, well before he is 16 years old and is more likely than other offenders to have spent a long time in juvenile facilities. The group was characterized as being more socially unstable—without jobs or family ties—and more given to multiple drug use than were other offenders.

A policy of selective incapacitation targeted on this group could reduce crime and, in some cases, conserve scarce resources as well. As the analyses demonstrated, the impact of such a policy would ultimately depend on both offender rates and current prison populations. In California, for example, a strategy of reducing terms for low and medium-rate robbers and increasing terms for high-rate robbers could achieve a 15 percent reduction in the robbery rate and reduce prison populations by 5 percent, according to the researchers. Among burglars, the best selective strategy analyzed by Rand required a 7 percent increase in prison population to achieve a 15 percent crime reduction.

The profile of career offenders stemming from Rand's analyses suggested a scale that could—when refined—help judges determine which defendants should receive longer prison terms. In its present form, the scale draws on factors such as previous length of incarceration, juvenile criminal history, history of drug use, and employment record. The study cautions that the scale, as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

currently proposed, entails a high risk of error. When properly refined it could enable a more explicit and accurate method of classifying offenders than the approaches currently used by the criminal justice system.

The serious, repeat offender is also the subject of other Institute research. A panel of experts convened by Harvard University in 1982 focused on the problems involving the detection and prosecution of the dangerous defendant. More aggressive police investigations, improved access to juvenile records, and better record-keeping practices were among the recommendations of the panel for improvements at the front end of the criminal justice system. With these improvements, defendants with serious criminal histories would face a greater likelihood of identification during their high-risk years.

A new research phase was launched on the career criminal during the year. It will focus on those serious offenders who do not mature out of crime but continue to prey on society well into middle age.

Violent Crime

A variety of Institute research projects are examining criminal violence. Some of these efforts focus on the nature and patterns of specific types of violent crimes. Others, including the research on career criminals, focus on violent offenders and their treatment by the criminal justice system.

Long-term trends in both violent and property crime were examined in another study published in 1982. Virtually every major U.S. city has experienced increases in crime during the post-war years 1948-1978, the study reported. Based on data gathered from 386 cities, the study found that violent crimes jumped more than 250 percent from 1950 to 1970, and property crimes soared 400 percent during the same period. While there was a four-fold increase in crime, there was only a two-fold increase in crime-fighting resources. Police officers per capita rose from 1.7 per 1,000 to 2.3 per 1,000 during the 30-year period, but the increase in law enforcement personnel did not keep abreast of crime rates.

A study of homicide last year documented the substantial increase in this crime during the 10-year period from 1968 through 1978 and revealed the increasing proportion of homicides committed by strangers as compared to those murders in which victim and offender are family members or acquaintances. The study also found a high degree of city-to-city variation in homicide rates and patterns.

A study on robbery detailed the patterns and trends in this most frequent violent crime. Reported robbery rates tripled between 1965 and 1975. The rate leveled off from 1976 through 1978 but returned to about the 1975 level in 1979 and soared to a new high in 1980. A crime that is concentrated in the big cities, robbery is predominantly stranger-to-stranger, and it generates a great deal of fear because of the potential for violence. Indeed, one-third of the victims are injured in robberies, the study reported, and current indicators suggest that violence in robberies may be increasing. Answers to this and other questions will be sought in new proposed research.

Recently completed research on weapons and violent crime reviewed existing literature and surveyed the amount and quality of data recorded by police and courts. The estimated 100 to 140 million guns in private ownership in 1978 represented an increase of 40 million over the number in 1968, the study reported. Most of this increase could be accounted for by the growth in the number of U.S. households and the increased purchases by sport shooters, hunters, and police. No definitive evidence was found to link a fear of crime generally or a fear of violence to the increase in gun ownership. Nor was there reliable evidence that private weapons are an important cause of, or deterrent to, violent crime. The landmark report of this research has been used extensively by Federal, State, and local agencies.

An Institute project that neared completion in 1982 responds to a recommendation of the Attorney General's Violent Crime Task Force. It explores the problem of school crime and provides practical suggestions for reducing it to school boards and administrators, municipal officials, and law enforcement and courts personnel. A policy brief will analyze the legal issues in school crime and outline key features and potential benefits of a local action agenda. A monograph will pull together information on the nature and extent of crime in American schools and various approaches to reduction or prevention. A brief guide for school principals will explain methods for collecting, recording, and analyzing school crime information and using the data to devise workable tactics for crime prevention and control.

Related Institute efforts are examining criminal justice programs that focus on violent crimes and violent offenders to determine effective approaches for implementation on a wider scale. For example, assessments of career criminal prosecution units continued during 1982 with the evaluation of "Operation Hardcore," a Los Angeles prosecution unit that concentrates on homicides committed by gangs. The evaluation revealed that the project achieved higher conviction rates and increased rates of conviction to the most serious charge, compared to similar cases handled by the regular prosecution units. Also nearing completion in 1982 was an assessment of the New York State Violent Felony Warrant Squad. This project was one of several local innovations identified as promising programs that focus specifically on violent criminals. The New York program uses State police to track down felons wanted for violent crime and narcotics offenses who have fled local jurisdictions. The Institute's assessment will analyze whether the approach is suitable for adoption in other States.

Drugs and Crime

Research also is beginning to increase the understanding of the relationship between drugs and crime. Institute research on the career offender, for example, illustrates the clear association between severe addiction and high levels of criminality and the corresponding decreases in crime associated with reduced drug usage. Analyses of a sample of Baltimore addicts showed similar results—daily heroin users committed violent crimes at a rate 21 times higher than when they were relatively drug free.

Are addicts more likely to commit crimes while they are on a high or while they are in the grip of a withdrawal? Is drug usage perceived as part of a criminal lifestyle or is the need for a fix the compelling motive? These and similar questions are being addressed by an Institute project exploring basic issues concerning the relationship of crime to drugs and alcohol.

Now in the early stages of its investigation, the Interdisciplinary Research Center for the Study of the Relations of Drugs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and Alcohol to Crime is studying a sample of hardcore addicts and alcoholics in East Harlem, New York. The research is examining their criminal behavior and probing their motives and perceptions of how opiates contributed to their criminal activity. Another study group for the project is a sample of youth in "Yule City," a northeastern metropolitan area representative of urban America. The interviews and data obtained on these youth, who are in the formative years for drug and deliquency involvement, are expected to afford a clearer picture of when these behavior patterns emerge and how they interact.

Victim Research

The plight of crime victims was underscored by the Attorney General's Violent Crime Task Force, which made several recommendations about victim rights.

A new NIJ study of crime victim compensation responds to the Task Force's call for current information and analysis of the experience and cost of compensation programs throughout the Nation. Institute researchers have surveyed all the programs now operating in 36 States and the District of Columbia. The resulting handbook details advantages and disadvantages of different types of programs, the cost of various approaches, and the sources of funding—particularly the experience to date in using fines and penalties as sources of revenue.

Among other recent research on victims is a study examining the experiences of 274 New Yorkers who had been victimized by robberies, assaults, or burglaries. Interviews with the victims four months after the incidents found the majority of them plagued by psychological problems—fear, anxiety, self-blame, difficulty sleeping—regardless of the nature of the crime. The study also reported that all but two of the victims turned to friends or relatives for assistance in coping with their problems rather than to the services of formal victim agencies. Many of the New York victims were unaware that there were agencies that could assist them.

To improve the outreach of such services, NIJ sponsored a study analyzing six victim assistance programs. All have particularly strong links to criminal justice and social service agencies, affording a direct line of contact between victims and the agencies that serve their needs.

Research also has addressed the difficult problem of domestic violence and other nonstranger violence cases, and a training workshop for criminal justice officials was held in 1982 on effective ways to cope with these cases. Research now in progress is looking at the issue of how victims respond—from resistance to submission—to violent assaults. It will help answer such questions as: Does resistance heighten the risk of injury or death?

Another study is following up on an important issue raised by the Violent Crime Task Force. Researchers are surveying victims and criminal justice professionals to determine the extent to which the full impact of the crime on the victim is considered in decisions made by the criminal justice system. The aim is to identify the most useful procedures for ensuring that the degree of harm suffered by the victim receives full consideration.

An Institute study on citizen crime prevention efforts published in 1982 included a survey of the specific anticrime measures taken by a sample of Chicago citizens. At least a third of the citizens had strengthened the security of their households by such measures as installing alarms or window bars, special locks, special outdoor lights, or the use of timers on lights or radios. About one-third also engraved their valuables with identification marks, which is a measure more often taken by younger citizens than by older ones, presumably because of its recent addition to the list of crime prevention tips. As for group anticrime efforts, less than one-tenth of the citizens had ever participated in community crime prevention efforts per se. However, a majority reported membership in at least one formal voluntary organization in which crime prevention was a part of the agenda. The study concluded that community concerns as a whole, rather than specific crime problems, are the reason for citizen volunteer activities. This and the social bonds formed by group participation are the compelling motives for their involvement, a finding which the study called to the attention of police and community leaders recruiting members for crime prevention campaigns.

Building Stronger Cases

Studies indicate that a significant number of even the most serious cases—violent crimes—wash out before conviction. For example, research by NIJ and the Bureau of Justice Statistics indicate that half of all felony arrests fail to result in conviction. To learn why this is so, recent Institute research has focused on the chain of events that follow an arrest.

Several studies published in 1982 examined problems in the interconnected work of police and prosecutors in processing criminal cases. One study identified two major weaknesses in current practices: police often do not give prosecutors the information necessary to follow through on arrest and complete successful prosecution; prosecutors often fail to communicate information needs to police and inform them of dispositions or reasons for dismissals. The study urged specific recommendations to strengthen communication and coordination between police and prosecutors, including a revamping of the case transfer process to facilitate a direct exchange between the prosecutor assigned to the case and the police officer with the most knowledge about the case.

Another study of case processing focused on the quality of arrests—their convictability. Based on research in eight jurisdictions, the study reported that in typical police departments only a few officers consistently produce quality arrests. Interviews with police officers in Washington, D.C., and New York City revealed that those with high conviction rates paid more attention to locating and dealing with witnesses, used a two-pronged interviewing approach—a factual line of inquiry and an indirect psychological style—to question witnesses, and persisted with the details of processing evidence, locating witnesses, and the like in followup investigations.

Assessing the impact of sentencing reforms has been the focus of several efforts. A panel of experts convened by the National Academy of Sciences reviewed the existing information on sentencing guidelines, mandatory sentences, and similar reforms and commissioned papers on issues that warranted additional examination. The final report was expected by the end of 1982. Also nearing completion at the end of the year was a field experiment that tested the use of sentencing guidelines in selected jurisdictions in two States.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Managing Resources

Institute studies examining current law enforcement agency practices have suggested alternatives for police service delivery. For example, research on citizen crime reporting patterns and police response times have suggested improved systems for managing calls for service. By 1982 experimental programs involving these alternative approaches had been sufficiently tested and refined in several sites, enabling the Institute to implement a field test of a system for classifying and responding to citizen calls. Through screening procedures, the system uses less costly responses—telephone reporting, delayed response by an officer—to handle nonemergencies, thus freeing resources for critical calls and other police department priorities.

Research Into Practice

To encourage the use of new information by criminal justice agencies, the Institute translates research results into operational terms and presents them in a variety of formats for practitioners. Manuals and reports offer practical guidance for agencies in adopting new approaches. For example, "Measuring the Costs of Police Services," published in 1982, describes the most advanced cost analysis techniques for estimating the indirect as well as the direct costs of police services. The report explains how the techniques can serve as tools for realigning departmental policies. Other reports published in 1982 included "The Use of Mediation and Arbitration in Small Claims Disputes," and "Police Citation in Lieu of Arrest." For particularly significant research results, the ideas are shaped into a workable program and tested in actual operational settings. A field test on "Differential Police Response" was in progress last year. At the same time, evaluations were nearing completion on these field tests: Commercial Security, Structured Plea Negotiation, and Multijurisdictional Sentencing Guidelines.

Results from research studies and field tests are communicated directly to practitioners through the Research Utilization Workshops. In 1982 "Improved Police Management" was presented to 472 senior police officials. A total of 182 municipal and criminal justice officials attended the workshop on "Cutback Management" presented in five localities.

NIJ also maintains an international clearinghouse of information on crime and justice at the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. The Reference Service meets the needs of 40,000 criminal justice practitioners and researchers here and abroad, keeping them abreast of the latest knowledge about all parts of the criminal justice system. Reference specialists furnish resource materials on criminal justice topics or conduct customized searches of the Reference Service data base, which has 67,000 items. Dissemination of criminal justice publications, including the NCJRS bibliographies and other reference tools, amounted to 250,273 documents in 1982, or an average of 20,000 documents monthly.

Sound information on which to base purchasing decisions is a critical need for criminal justice agencies. NIJ sponsors the development and testing of performance standards for the technology and equipment needed for criminal justice operations. Among the better-known products of this program is the lightweight body armor, the Kevlar protective vests, developed and tested under NIJ auspices. The bullet-resistant vests have been credited with saving more than 400 police lives. Tests of riot helmets, which were conducted in 1982, revealed that only six of 15 helmets available on the market could meet the performance criteria for penetration, and only four of the 15 helmets met the impact requirements. Other items tested in 1982 included handcuffs, crash helmets, transceivers, and drug test kits.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bureau of Justice Statistics

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the national repository for statistical information about crime and the operation of criminal justice systems at all levels of government. It also is a source of financial and technical support to State statistical and operating agencies in all of the States and territories. It develops national information policy on such issues as the privacy, confidentiality, and security of data and the interstate exchange of criminal records.

In the three years since its creation, the Bureau has developed a program that responds to the diverse requirements of the Justice System Improvement Act. The Act responded to more than half a century of recommendations calling for an independent and objective national center to provide basic information on crime to the President, the Congress, the judiciary, State and local governments, the general public, and the news media. The Bureau was established to ensure the collection of adequate statistics on crime and the response to crime from Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies; to improve the accuracy, completeness, and usefulness of these agencies' statistics; to assist in the development of adequate State and local statistical systems; to direct attention to policy implications of criminal justice data collection, utilization, and exchange; and to conduct surveys, censuses, and special studies in response to immediate policy issues confronting the Department of Justice and the Congress.

Data Analysis and Dissemination. The Bureau of Justice Statistics has developed a responsive data analysis and dissemination capability. An ongoing internal analytic capability is maintained to provide the Administration and the Congress with timely and accurate data regarding problems of crime and the administration of justice in the Nation. The Bureau's Government-wide leadership role in the preparation of the 1981 National Indicators System Briefing on Violent Crime is an example of this role. This briefing was presented to the President in September of that year and circulated in the Congress. Another major function of the Bureau's dissemination program is to provide regular analytic reporting to inform the public about crime and justice issues. The Bureau prepared and disseminated almost 35 analytic reports during the year. The analysis program is conducted primarily by in-house staff, employing the Bureau's on-line computing and graphics capability. The initial analyses of the National Crime Survey and of several correctional surveys are performed by personnel at the U.S. Bureau of the Census funded through an interagency agreement.

National Report on Crime and Justice. The primary focus of the Bureau's analysis program in fiscal year 1982 was the preparation of the "National Report on Crime and Justice." Designated as a priority program by the Attorney General, this report will serve as a comprehensive presentation of statistical information concerning crime and the administration of justice. In addition to the Bureau's own data sources, the report draws on data from other Federal, State, and local agencies as well as a variety of other research and reference materials.

The National Report provides a hitherto unavailable treatment of complicated issues associated with the criminal event, offenders and victims, and the institutional response to crime in a style appropriate for a general audience. Now in the final stages of preparation, this report is expected to be published in 1983.

The Bulletin Series. The Bureau's bulletins, initiated in 1981, present data generated in the various statistical series. They are published on a regular basis in a nontechnical format suitable for a broad audience. Each addresses a topic on crime or the administration of justice. During fiscal year 1982 twelve bulletins were published.

Technical Reports and the Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics. The Bureau has initiated a technical report series that presents the findings of the Bureau's statistical series and technical research programs and addresses issues of statistical methodology. The technical reports are produced as appropriate topics arise. The first was published in July 1982 and presented 1980 National Crime Survey data.

During the year the Bureau published the ninth edition of the "Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics," which presents criminal justice statistical data from more than 100 sources in an easy-to-use single volume.

The National Criminal Justice Data Archive. The Bureau sponsors the National Criminal Justice Data Archive at the Interuniversity Consortium of Political and Social Science at the University of Michigan. It provides assistance to data users whose needs are not satisfied by published statistics. All of the Bureau's data tapes as well as other high-quality data are stored at the Archive and are disseminated via magnetic tapes compatible with the user's computing facility. In addition, the Archive disseminates microfilmed National Crime Survey data for users who lack access to computing facilities.

Methodological Evaluation. During the year the Bureau engaged in major projects to assess and evaluate the methodology used in the Nation's two most important statistical series on crime, the National Crime Survey and the Uniform Crime Reporting program.

The potential modifications to the National Crime Survey that were studied include incorporating data on crimes that are not currently covered, techniques to improve victims' recall and reporting of crime incidents, collection of additional information about crime incidents and about the activities and characteristics of crime victims and nonvictims, improvements in the sampling efficiency of the survey and changes in data collection procedures, and techniques for investigating crime problems in small geographic areas.

During the year the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Federal Bureau of Investigation completed preparations for a major national assessment of the Uniform Crime Reporting program that will be sponsored jointly by the two agencies. The project will convene a consortium of organizations to analyze the Uniform Crime Reporting program, to review the current and potential utilization of its data, and to make recommendations for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

improving the program.

Adjudication Statistics. The Adjudication Program is designed to provide the Bureau and other researchers with national statistics on felony prosecution, public defense, trial court processing, and appellate review.

During the year the Bureau continued its support of the National Court Statistics Project conducted by the National Center for State Courts. Three documents from the project were published: "State Court Model Statistical Dictionary," "State Court Model Annual Report," and "State Court Organization, 1980."

Another adjudication project supported by the Bureau collects and analyzes case processing data from jurisdictions that employ the Prosecutor's Management Information System (PROMIS). Data tapes were collected from 26 jurisdictions, analysis of the data was begun, and a report was prepared in draft form.

A new effort begun during the year focuses on indigent defense systems. The Bureau supported a national survey of such systems to collect statewide data on existing defense systems, the costs associated with each, the methods of organization, the legal characteristics of each system, and associated demographic and economic variables.

The Bureau also sponsored a project through the National Center for State Courts that will document, analyze, and forecast appellate court caseload trends. The data from this project and its analysis will help judges and lawmakers respond to increasing appellate caseloads.

National Crime Surveys. The Bureau's most important statistical series is the National Crime Survey. The survey collects data through national household interviews using methodology similar to that used to collect basic labor-force statistics.

The data for developing survey statistics are provided to the Bureau of Justice Statistics by the U.S. Bureau of the Census from interviews in 60,000 households in which persons 12 years of age and older are asked if they were crime victims during the preceding six months. The survey measures the amount of rape, robbery, assault, personal larceny, household burglary and larceny, and motor vehicle theft experienced by the U.S. population. It also provides detailed information about the characteristics of the victims, the victim-offender relationships, and the criminal incident, including the extent of any loss or injury and whether or not the offense was reported to law enforcement officials.

In September 1982 the Bureau released, for the second year, the findings of an indicator, developed from National Crime Survey data, on the prevalence of crime. It measures the proportion of American households touched by crime and has revealed that crime victimization is one of the most common negative life events that a family can suffer. During 1981 almost 25 million households, nearly a third of the households in the nation, were so victimized. A similar proportion of households have been victimized in each of the six years (1976 through 1981) for which the measure has been calculated.

Information from the National Crime Survey continues to influence criminal justice legislation at the Federal, State, and local levels in such matters as crime against the elderly, rape, stranger-to-stranger street crime, and programs to compensate victims. The survey is the only source of information about the detailed characteristics of the victims of crime throughout the Nation. It gives legislators and the public knowledge of which groups in the population are disproportionately victimized and the impact of such criminal victimization on their lives.

Federal Statistics. The Bureau has placed a major emphasis on developing its newly established program in Federal statistics. A study was undertaken to analyze the potential for linking Federal criminal justice data that is collected by the various components of the Federal justice system. A bulletin describing the flow of Federal cases and defendants through the criminal justice system was published, and preparation of the first comprehensive compendium of Federal justice data was initiated.

The Bureau completed a major study of computer crime associated with electronic transfer of funds. Reports were issued on the legal and security aspects of computer crime.

Privacy, Confidentiality, and Information Policy. In keeping with its role as a source of criminal justice statistical data, the Bureau continued activities to ensure the confidentiality of statistical data and the privacy and security of criminal history information. Formal interagency negotiations were conducted, and a study of the impact of confidentiality legislation on research activity was completed.

Work was done to explore the information policy implications of current criminal justice strategies, such as the violent offender and career criminal programs. A national conference on "The Impact of Criminal Justice Program Initiatives on Data Requirements and Information Policy" was jointly sponsored with SEARCH Group, Inc., and attracted several nationally prominent criminal justice scholars. Documents were prepared addressing related issues, such as the use of juvenile justice data in the criminal justice system.

The Bureau also issued the fourth in its series of Privacy and Security Legislative Compendiums. They list and analyze State legislation concerning criminal justice information policy and systems.

Correctional Statistics Program. The Correctional Statistics Program provides systematic data on correctional populations and agency workloads covering probation, local jails, State and Federal prisons, and parole. The overall program consists of five component activities: the National Probation Reports; surveys and censuses of local jails; National Prisoner Statistics, surveys and censuses of State and Federal prisons; Uniform parole Reports; and special reports on selected correctional topics.

The National Probation Reports series develop annual statistics on the number of persons under a sentence of probation. Complete national reporting on this population became available for the first time during the past year. The bulletin "Probation and Parole 1981" indicates that at the end of 1981 almost one out of every 136 adults was serving a sentence of probation in the community.

The second major element of the Correctional Statistics Program is the regular reporting of information describing the characteristics of the inmates and facilities of the Nation's jails. A four-volume report, "1978 Census of Jails," was completed. It covered the approximately 3,500 locally-operated detention and confinement facilities and the almost 160,000 persons who reside in them.

National Prisoner Statistics is the oldest of all the correc-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tional series, dating back to 1926. It provides quarterly and annual counts of prisoners in State and Federal institutions. A recent emphasis has been on gathering data on the characteristics of those entering and leaving prison, including demographic data, sentencing information, and time served. The National Prisoner Statistics program also reports separately on those State prisoners sentenced to and awaiting execution. Four such reports were produced during the year.

The Uniform Parole Reports program, which began annual reporting in 1976, provides information about the populations and characteristics of those persons conditionally released from prison to supervision in the community. The program also reports on the performance of selected parolee groups. which are tracked for up to three years while under supervision. The major publication during the year, "Probation and Parole 1981," reported State-by-State counts of parolees at the end of 1980 and 1981 and exits from parole during 1981.

The special reports component of the Correctional Statistics Program published two reports during the year, "Veterans in Prison" and a description of inmate and facility characteristics entitled "Prisons and Prisoners."

State Statistical and Systems Programs. The Congress has directed the Bureau to "give primary emphasis to problems of State and local justice systems" and "utilize to the maximum extent feasible State government organizations and facilities responsible for the collection and analysis of criminal justice data and statistics." The Bureau has responded by expanding the analytic capabilities of the States, encouraging cooperation among the States in addressing common problems, and enhancing the ability of the States to provide the Bureau with data for national compilations.

Through the Bureau's support, statistical analysis centers for criminal justice data have been established in approximately 40 States. They provide statistical information services and policy guidance to the Governors, executive branch agencies, legislators, State and local criminal justice agencies, the judiciary, the press, and the public. In addition, they play a vital role in collecting and submitting data to the Bureau. In many States the statistical analysis center has been made a part of the State government by legislation or executive order.

During the year grants were awarded to establish new statistical analysis centers in three States where they had not existed previously, and the continuing operation of seven others was supported by grants and cooperative agreements. In addition, the Bureau entered into cooperative agreements with 27 State statistical analysis centers for the performance of specific tasks in accordance with programs developed by the Bureau. These included establishing and maintaining clearinghouses for criminal justice statistical information, the study and analysis of specific issues in criminal justice in which the issues were selected by the States as being of critical importance, and the development of analytic methodology and techniques.

The Bureau also supports the development and operation of State uniform crime reporting systems in more than 40 States to facilitate the submission and improve the validity and reliability of arrest and clearance data submitted by local police agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. During the year grants were awarded to two States to complete their systems. In addition, awards were made to twelve States to assist them in continuing the effective operation of systems that already were in operation but were in danger of deteriorating or being abandoned because of the lack of adequate State funding.

State Assistance for National Corrections Reporting is a new program in which 22 States began participating during the year. This program is designed to enhance the reporting for national programs. Two national workshops on prison population forecasting were conducted. They were attended by corrections personnel from 25 States, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government. A prototype Probation Information System and a Corrections Resource Management Information System were implemented in two States for testing and evaluation.

The Bureau continued to support the Police Executive Research Forum in its development of a crime classification system to assist police chiefs in more effectively managing and administering their departments. This classification system, which is based on the extent of harm to the victim, is being tested in four cities.

Five-Year Program Plan. During the year the Bureau updated and published the "Bureau of Justice Statistics Five-Year Program—1982-86." This plan describes the overall goals and objectives to be achieved by the Bureau during the period and outlines general programs and projects to be undertaken.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) administers a program of assistance to State and local communities to enhance juvenile justice as well as reduce and prevent delinquency. It also is responsible for coordinating and providing policy direction to all Federal juvenile delinquency-related programs to assure effectiveness and avoid duplication. The Office administers a special emphasis prevention and treatment program through which initiatives of critical importance are developed and emphasized. The National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention reviews Federal policies concerning juvenile justice and advises the Administrator about the work of the Office. Within the Office is the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, which conducts research, evaluates programs, provides specialized training, and disseminates information of value to concerned agencies.

Concentration of Federal Effort

The interdepartmental Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention continued its aggressive efforts to develop objectives and priorities for and to coordinate Federal programs and activities concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The Coordinating Council exchanged information on activities, initiated cooperatively supported programs, and planned future Council activities. The resulting plan was based upon input from Council members and the public, the latter having been received at two public hearings.

The Council's program plan is divided into the following five issue areas:

- The Facilitation of School-Related Approaches to Delinquency Prevention.
- Encouraging Youth Involvement in the Community Through Private Sector and Government Programs.
- Treatment Alternatives for Drug and Alcohol Abusing Juveniles.
- Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention.
- Assistance to Federal and State Decision-Makers in the Appropriate Placement of Juveniles.

The Council fosters information sharing, coordination, program development, and policy implementation.

A variety of activities are already under way in each of the areas. It is anticipated that these activities will be supplemented with the initiation of several new activities in each area, implemented jointly by various members of the Council. Council members concentrate on coordinating program activities in the priority areas and sharing information related to these areas. Activities have been designed both to eliminate costly duplication and to streamline the delivery of services and products to the constituencies of the various Council members.

National Advisory Committee

The National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is mandated by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 1980. It is appointed by the President to advise the Administrator of OJJDP, and it brings together a group of persons from throughout the United States who have special knowledge about the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and the administration of juvenile justice.

During 1982 the committee met, reviewed the programs and plans of OJJDP, and made specific recommendations to the Administrator about juvenile justice standards and policies and Office programs.

In addition to the above duties, the Committee must report annually by March 31 to the President and the Congress on its activities and present its findings and recommendations.

Formula Grants

The Office provides formula grants to participating States and territories based on their populations of youths under 18 years old. With almost two-thirds of the OJJDP budget, the formula grants section coordinates the distribution of monies to States for the development and maintenance of juvenile justice programs. All States are eligible for a minimum of $225,000 per year.

To qualify for the Federal money, the State must submit a plan detailing comprehensive coordinated approaches to juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment and match the Federal contribution with State funds. The plan must specify that 75 percent of the allocated money be used for "advanced technique" programs. Among these programs are ones designed to develop, maintain, and expand juvenile delinquency prevention services; to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system; to provide community-based alternatives to confinement in secure detention and correctional facilities; and to improve programs for serious offenders. The plan must include itemized estimated costs for the development and implementation of such programs.

In addition, States must seek consultation with private agencies concerned with juvenile justice when drawing up the State plan.

The separation of juveniles and adults and the removal of youthful offenders from adult jails and lock-ups has received considerable State legislative attention. The 1974 Act requires that participating States remove status offenders and nonoffenders, such as dependent children, from secure juvenile detention or secure correctional facilities.

The Act also requires that juvenile offenders not be detained

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

or confined in any institution in which they are in regular contact with adults incarcerated because they have been convicted or who are awaiting trial on criminal charges.

While most States are trying to comply with the first two criteria, a 1980 amendment to the Act goes further by requiring the removal of all juveniles from adult jails and lock-ups by 1985. Those States that comply with the removal criteria in 75 percent of their facilities will be granted two additional years to complete the process.

In the past, the State plans were authorized and administered by State Criminal Justice Councils (CJCs) (formerly State Planning Agencies). A 1980 amendment allows the Governor of each State discretionary power in giving final approval authority for the plan to the CJCs or the State Advisory Groups (SAGs). This change should increase the influence of SAGs in the funding process. Consisting of advocates for youth outside the official juvenile justice system, SAGs formerly had limited authority to control the disbursement of Federal money.

During fiscal year 1982, 45 States and six territories (Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Trust Territories, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Marianas) received formula grant awards totalling $42,665,000. State and territorial allocations were based on their population of juveniles (under 18 years of age). The minimum allocation to each State was $225,000 and to each territory, $56,250.

The deinstitutionalization of status offenders and the separation of juveniles from adult offenders in jails and correctional facilities has been a major emphasis of the State programs with the goal of the complete removal of juveniles from adult jails and lock-ups by December 1985. Participating States and territories also were encouraged to invest up to 30 percent of the formula funds in special efforts to deal with serious violent juvenile offenders. Forty-eight States and territories have met the special requirements of the enabling Act by demonstrating substantial or full compliance with the deinstitutionalization of status offenders. Twenty-five States have complied with the requirements for the separation of adults and juveniles in adult jails and lock-ups. Most of the remainder are making credible progress.

Through an interagency agreement with ACTION, the Foster Grandparent Program is furnishing volunteer staff members to youth-serving agencies, thereby providing links to formula grant funded programs in Georgia, Louisiana, Michigan, and Washington.

Technical Assistance

During 1982, more than 440 instances of formal technical assistance and more than 2,300 Office staff hours were provided to State and local agencies. This excludes approximately 5,000 requests for documentation that were responded to by the technical assistance providers during that same period. Assistance was provided in a number of subjects and skill areas, but the emphasis was on serious and violent juvenile crime, restitution, alternatives to the juvenile justice system, removing juveniles from adult jails, and delinquency prevention.

In providing technical assistance, the Office's three goals were:

- Prevention: to preclude the first occurrence of all types of juvenile offenses, including minor, serious, violent, and status offenses.
- Alternatives to and for the system: to establish alternative responses to delinquent behavior for those juveniles who have had some official contact with the system.
- Improvement of the system: to develop and assist the implementation of policies and procedures of juvenile justice agencies that promote future law-abiding behavior, ensure effective allocation of system resources, and otherwise enhance administration.

All technical assistance delivered within these areas was based on the principle that strengthening a child's bond to society (that is, family, school, and the community) will contribute to law-abiding behavior.

Special Emphasis

The following major demonstration programs were continued in fiscal year 1982:

- Restitution by Juvenile Offenders provided the courts with the alternative sanction of requiring offenders through appropriate work to render monetary payment, victim services, or community services restitution.
- Project New Pride provided specially-designed intensive, comprehensive, community-based treatment for serious offenders. It reduced recidivism, increased school and social achievements, and provided employment opportunities.
- The Alternative Education Program reduced dropout, truancy, and suspension rates through a special modification of ineffective and adverse school policies and curricula and the provision of special educational opportunities for youths whose needs were not being met in traditional classrooms.
- Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups assisted communities in taking youths out of inappropriate surroundings.
- The Violent Juvenile Offender Program is a major research and development effort with two subprograms. Part I has used the most effective known approaches, which include the development of performance contracts with young offenders that specify services to be provided, the responsibilities of the youths, and the penalties if contract terms are not met. Medical, dental, psychological, and psychiatric analyses as well as complete family, social, and criminal histories are made as are vocational and other skill assessments. Remedial services are provided. Part II, the newer program, tests the ability of community organizations to mobilize residents to control youth behavior and to encourage local institutions to exercise more effective youth control and supervision.

All programs receive programwide evaluations by firms and professionals who have no other interests in the program.

The preliminary evaluation report for the restitution program during the first two years, 1979-1981, has shown the following major accomplishments:

- Of the 15,427 closed restitution cases, 83 percent of the juveniles had no further contact with the juvenile court prior to case closure.
- Program costs averaged approximately $820 per youth, whereas incarceration costs ranged from $24,000 to $43,000 per year.
- About 17,300 youths participated during the first two years, paying $1,532,966 in monetary restitution, working 259,092

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

hours of community service, and performing more than 4,060 hours of direct victim services. More than 18,390 victims and $9.5 million were involved in the offenses committed by these youths.

Project New Pride results to date show that many of these serious juvenile offenders who failed in traditional programs made considerable progress after being enrolled in Project New Pride:

- Through September 1982, 1,448 youngsters were referred to New Pride. There were 877 active clients and 238 youngsters completed the 12-month program. (Many who did not complete the program nonetheless left under positive circumstances).
- The average monthly percent of clients charged with offenses fell from 22.8 percent to 9.2 percent, and the average number of offenses fell from 91 per month to 25 per month.
- Two-thirds of the clients were school dropouts. During enrollment the average percentage of unexcused school absences dropped from 58 percent to 36 percent—more than one-third.
- The average testing gain in math was one year, and the average in reading approximately two years. These preliminary gain findings scores were highly significant statistically.
- The average cost per child (all serious offenders) in New Pride is approximately $6,000 vs. $24,000 to $43,000 for incarceration.

The Alternative Education Program also has shown encouraging results:

- More than 10,000 students have participated with more than 1,000 teachers and school administrators having received training in alternative education techniques.
- Projects have resulted in some level of system change at 85 percent of the project sites. Changes range from specific procedural modifications to an entire school district adopting an alternative technique to deal with expulsions and suspension.
- Attendance has significantly improved among project schools, with considerable academic improvement in some projects. Fewer referrals for disciplinary action also have been the result at some sites.

National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

During fiscal year 1982 the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Training, Dissemination, and Standards Division was charged with the responsibility of improving the juvenile justice system's ability to handle serious and violent juvenile offenders more effectively; increase society's and the juvenile justice system's ability to prevent, treat, and control delinquent behavior when discovered; increase the range of effective alternatives to the juvenile justice system; improve collection, information, and dissemination activities; and increase the knowledge and awareness of the extent and nature of juvenile delinquency.

The Division implemented a number of programs and activities during fiscal year 1982. Highlights of these activities are as follows:

- Law-Related Education. A coordinated effort involving six national organizations to expand the teaching of law-related subjects to young people in schools and community-based programs throughout the country. Institutionalization efforts focused in three target states: California, Michigan, and North Carolina.
- Courts. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges provided training and consultation to juvenile and family court judges and court-related personnel in order to improve the effectiveness and operation of juvenile and family courts.
- Support of Program Development. Program designs and training support were provided to agencies and jurisdictions selected to participate in research and development efforts.
- Community-Based Training. The National Youth Work Alliance provided training to personnel working and concerned with developing alternatives to institutions and secure care programs for chronic, serious, and violent juvenile offenders.
- Correctional Training. NIJJDP, with the National Institute of Corrections, conducted management training for juvenile justice administrators in both formal and alternative systems.
- Law Enforcement Training. In conjunction with the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia, law enforcement personnel were trained in such subjects as youth gangs, serious/violent offenders, diversion, youth with learning disabilities, and arson.
- Prosecution. The National College of District Attorneys provided training to state and local prosecutors who appear in juvenile courts.

Dissemination. The information dissemination component concentrated in five general areas:

- Data Collection. The Juvenile Information System and Records Access and the National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System collected, processed, analyzed, and reported information about youths and the juvenile justice system and developed automated juvenile justice information systems that produced data on the handling of youths by the juvenile justice system. The University of Chicago conducted a survey of residential programs for children and youths served by mental health, child welfare, and juvenile justice agencies and programs. In conjunction with the Bureau of Census, a national census on public and private juvenile custody facilities was conducted.
- Data Synthesis. The assessment centers collected, assessed, and synthesized nationwide data and information on all significant aspects of juvenile justice.
- General Information Programs. The Institute for Educational Leadership administered a journalism fellowship program that allowed journalists to assess the improvement and effectiveness of existing juvenile justice programs.
- Document Review and Management Support. NIJJDP secured services from experts in the field for the review of concept papers, research proposals, and publications.
- Information Dissemination. The National Criminal Justice Reference Service Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse provided information to juvenile justice practitioners about all aspects of juvenile justice.

Standards. The primary program component in the standards area consisted of the development and implementation of intensive training conferences in several regions of the country on legislative, administrative, and judicial uses of standards. Additional activities in the standards area included:

- The URSA Institute examined juvenile parole decision-making throughout the country, looking at the organization of juvenile parole authorities, the policies and criteria used to arrive

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

at parole decisions, and the effects of these decisions on the juvenile offender population.

- The Institute for Policy Analysis developed reports based on the research of a three-year study of the implementation and impact of significant innovations in Washington State's juvenile code.
- The National Council of Juvenile Justice conducted a study to determine the feasibility of an automated juvenile code archive to facilitate the compilation, review, and analysis of juvenile codes and new developments in State legislation concerning the handling and treatment of juveniles.

Research and program development activities were continued in each of three major areas: delinquent behavior and prevention, juvenile justice system, and alternatives to the traditional juvenile justice system. Consistent with the 1980 amendments to the Act, the majority of resources in each area are focused on serious juvenile crime.

Activities included the following:

- The extent, characteristics, and trends of delinquency in the United States were monitored.
- Analyses of justice system processing of juvenile offenders were continued.
- Long-term studies were continued to improve the understanding of the development of delinquent and criminal careers and the capability to predict future involvement in crime.
- Research on justice system organization policies and practices was initiated to determine the most effective and efficient methods of handling juvenile offenders.
- National evaluations of special emphasis demonstration and research and development programs in the areas of prevention, restitution, and alternative correctional programs for serious juvenile offenders were continued.
- A special program of research into serious juvenile crime was organized. The major objectives of the serious juvenile crime research program are:

—To improve the understanding of the causes of delinquency and to increase the capability to predict serious criminal behavior.

—To monitor national trends in juvenile involvement in serious crime.

—To determine the effects of justice system practices on the processing of serious juvenile offenders.

—To evaluate the effectiveness of programs designed to prevent or reduce serious juvenile crime.

Specific topics under investigation included the identification of chronic serious juvenile offenders, the relationship of juvenile delinquency to adult crime, the effects of transferring juveniles charged with serious offenses to criminal court and a comparison of dispositions and outcomes for juveniles handled in juvenile and adult courts. Research also was conducted on the effectiveness of various correctional interventions, such as restitution, intensive supervision, case management with gradual movement to less secure programs for serious juvenile offenders, and the effectiveness of community-based programs to prevent serious juvenile crime.

The evaluations of safe and effective alternatives to traditional correctional institution programs were continued.

Highlights of the preliminary and final research results follow:

- National rates of juvenile crime appear to be leveling off. However, the seriousness of crime committed by juveniles has increased in several urban centers.
- Factors such as violence in the family, involvement in law-violating gangs and groups, use of alcohol and other drugs, and residing in a high-crime neighborhood seem to contribute to the chronic involvement in serious crime of a small proportion of juveniles.
- A national self-reported survey of delinquency and drug use revealed an increase in drug use among juveniles between 1976 and 1978 and a clear association between the number of drugs used and delinquency.
- The preliminary results of the restitution evaluation show that restitution can be an effective disposition. Eighty-six percent of the closed cases were in full compliance, and about 83 percent of all the closed cases had no subsequent contacts for noncompliance or for a subsequent offense.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

State Criminal Justice Councils

Alabama
Robert G. Davis, Director
Alabama Law Enforcement Planning Agency
2863 Fairlane Drive, Executive Park
Building F, Suite 49
Montgomery, Alabama 36116
Phone: (205) 832-6830

Alaska
Richard I. Pegeus, Director
Administrative Services
Department of Law
Pouch K
Juneau, Alaska 99811
Phone: (907) 465-3679

American Samoa
La'auli A. Filoiali'i, Acting Director
Criminal Justing Planning Agency
Government of American Samoa
P. O. Box 3760
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799
Phone: Pago Pago 633-5221 (Overseas Operator)

Arizona
Joe Stephens, Manager
Criminal Justice Programs
Office of Economic Planning and Development
State Capitol
1700 W. Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: (602) 255-4592

Arkansas
Mary Ellen Henderson, Grant Administrator
Administrative Services Division
Department of Finance and Administration
P. O. Box 2485
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
Phone: (501) 371-1771

California
Greg Harding, Acting Director
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Suite 600
9719 Lincoln Village Drive
Sacramento, California 95827
Phone: (916) 366-5304

Colorado
James Vetter, Associate Director
Criminal Justice Affairs
Department of Local Affairs
1313 Sherman Street
Room 419
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone: (303) 866-4908

Connecticut
William H. Carbone, Under-Secretary
Office of Policy and Management
Justice Planning Division
75 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
Phone: (203) 566-3020

Delaware
William J. O'Rourke, Executive Director
Criminal Justice Planning Commission
State Office Building, 4th Floor
820 North French Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Phone: (302) 571-3437

District of Columbia
Shirley Wilson, Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Plans and Analysis
421 8th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: (202) 727-6537

Florida
Joyce D. Peterside, Bureau Chief
Bureau of Criminal Justice Assistance
2571 Executive Center Circle, East
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Phone: (904) 488-8016

Georgia
Chantal R. Akridge, Director
Grants Management and Audit Section
Georgia Department of Community Affairs
40 Marietta Street, N.W., 9th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
Phone: (404) 656-1725

Guam
Maria P. Mad, Executive Director
Guam Criminal Justice Planning Agency
Government of Guam, P. O. Box 2950
Agana, Guam 96910
Phone: Guam 472-8781 (Overseas Operator)

Hawaii
Irwin Tanaka, Director
State Law Enforcement Planning Agency
250 South King Street, Room 412
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Phone: (808) 548-3800

Idaho
L. G. Hopkins, Director
Department of Law Enforcement
Law Enforcement Assistance Division
6058 Corporal Lane
Boise, Idaho 83704
Phone: (208) 334-2364

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Illinois
William W. Holland, Acting Executive Director
Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
120 South Riverside Plaza, 10th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 454-1560

Indiana
Rosco Walters, Acting Executive Director
Indiana Criminal Justice Planning Agency
215-17 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202
Phone: (317) 232-1230

Iowa
Erv Fett, Budget Supervisor
Criminal Justice Agency
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Phone: (515) 281-3241

Kansas
David L. Ison, Chief
Systems & Procedures Section
Division of Accounts & Reports
Department of Administration
State Office Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612
Phone: (913) 296-2128

Kentucky
John R. Lancaster, Director
Division for Grant Programs
Kentucky Department of Justice
State Office Building Annex, First Floor
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Phone: (502) 564-3251

Louisiana
Elmer B. Litchfield, Executive Director
Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
and Administration of Criminal Justice
1885 Wooddale Boulevard, Room 615
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806
Phone: (504) 925-4418

Maine
Richard E. Perkins, Executive Director
Maine Criminal Justice Planning
and Assistance Agency
4 Wabon Street
Augusta, Maine 04330
Phone: (207) 289-3361

Maryland
Richard W. Friedman, Executive Director
Maryland Criminal Justice Coordinating
Council
One Investment Place, Suite 700
Towson, Maryland 21204
Phone: (301) 321-3612

Massachusetts
Walter Timilty, Acting Director
Committee on Criminal Justice
100 Cambridge Street
Room 2100
Boston, Massachusetts 02202
Phone: (617) 727-6300

Michigan
Richard Liles, Acting Director
Office of Criminal Justice Programs
Lewis Cass Building, Second Floor
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Phone: (517) 373-6655

Minnesota
Michael J. McMahon, Program Director
Criminal Justice Programs
Office of Local Government
Department of Energy, Planning
and Development
Hanover Building, First Floor
480 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Phone: (612) 296-3133

Mississippi
Roy Thigpen, Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
510 George Street, Suite 246
Jackson, Mississippi 39202
Phone: (601) 354-6892

Missouri
Edward Daniel, Director
Department of Public Safety
621 East Capitol - P. O. Box 1041
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Phone: (314) 751-4905

Montana
Michael Lavin, Administrator
Montana Board of Crime Control
303 North Roberts
Helena, Montana 59601
Phone: (406) 449-3604

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nebraska
Robert L. Tagg, Executive Director
Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement
and Criminal Justice
301 Centennial Mall South, P. O. Box 94946
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509
Phone: (402) 471-2194

Nevada
S. Barton Jacks, Director
Department of Motor Vehicles
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710
Phone: (702) 885-4405

New Hampshire
Judith Ryan, Acting Director
New Hampshire Crime Commission
11 Depot Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
Phone: (603) 271-3601

New Jersey
Harold Damon, Executive Director
New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
CN 083
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
Phone: (609) 292-3741

New Mexico
Paul Shoemaker, Director
Planning and Program Development
Bureau, ASD
Corrections and Criminal Rehabilitation
Department
113 Washington Avenue
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
Phone: (505) 827-5222

New York
Jack Birnbaum, Deputy Commissioner
State of New York
Division of Criminal Justice Services
80 Centre Street, Fourth Floor
New York, New York 10013
Phone: (212) 587-4453

North Carolina
Gordon Smith, III, Executive Director
Governor's Crime Commission
N.C. Dept. of Crime Control and Public Safety
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
Phone: (919) 733-4000

North Dakota
Michael Hill, Director
Training and Statistics Division
North Dakota Attorney General's Office
State Capitol
Bismark, North Dakota 58505
Phone: (701) 224-2594

Northern Mariana Islands
Richard D. Shewman, Director
Northern Mariana Islands Criminal Justice
Planning Agency
P. O. Box 1133
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950
Phone: Overseas Operator 9351

Ohio
Bennett J. Cooper, Assistant Director
Ohio Department of Economic and Community
Development
Office of Criminal Justice Services
30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Phone: (614) 466-7610

Oklahoma
Cindy Rambo, Executive Director
Dept. of Economic and Community Affairs
4545 N. Lincoln, Suite 285
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
Phone: (405) 528-8200

Oregon
Neal R. Fisher, Director
Oregon State Executive Department
155 Cottage Street, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310
Phone: (503) 378-4222

Pennsylvania
George F. Grode, Executive Director
Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency
P. O. Box 1167, Federal Square Station
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108
Phone: (717) 787-2040

Puerto Rico
Flavia Alfaro de Quevedo, Executive Director
Puerto Rico Crime Commission
GPO Box 1256
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00936
Phone: (809) 783-6218

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rhode Island
W. Bradley Crowther, Executive Director
Rhode Island Governor's Justice Commission
222 Quaker Lane
West Warwick, Rhode Island 02893
Phone: (401) 277-2620

South Carolina
Bruce Dew, Director
Division of Public Safety Programs
Edgar A. Brown State Office Building
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Phone: (803) 758-3573

South Dakota
Rod Anderson, Acting Director
Division of Law Enforcement Assistance
118 West Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
Phone: (605) 773-3665

Tennessee
Stephen H. Norris, Executive Director
Tennessee State Planning Office
Juvenile Justice Planning Division
18th Floor, James Polk Building
505 Deadrick Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
Phone: (615) 741-0729

Texas
David Herndon, Executive Director
Governor's Office of General Counsel
and Criminal Justice
Capitol Station
P. O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711
Phone: (512) 475-3001

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Kent Harvey, Acting Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950
Phone: Overseas Operator 9351

Utah
Hazen Locke, Director
Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration
255 South Third Street-East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Phone: (801) 533-5731

Vermont
Molly K. Corrigan, Executive Director
Vermont Commission on the Administration
of Justice
5th Floor, Pavilion Office Building
109 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602
Phone: (802) 828-2376

Virgin Islands
Glenn Tobey, Administrator
Virgin Islands Law Enforcement
Planning Commission
Box 3807
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801
Phone: (809) 774-6400

Virginia
Richard N. Harris, Director
Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Phone: (804) 786-4000

Washington
Frank Glaspey, Program Administration Manager
Office of Financial Management
Division of Accounting and Fiscal Services
Mail Stop ER13
400 E. Union
Olympia, Washington 98504
Phone: (206) 754-2802

West Virginia
Alicia G. Tyler, Executive Director
Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency
and Corrections
5790-A MacCorkle Avenue, S.E.
Charleston, West Virginia 25304
Phone: (304) 348-8814

Wisconsin
John H. Givens, III, Director
Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice
30 West Mifflin Street
10th Floor, Suite 1000
Madison, Wisconsin 53702
Phone: (608) 266-7488

Wyoming
William Colarusso, Administrator
Wyoming Attorney General's Planning
Committee on Criminal Administration
720 West 18th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
Phone: (307) 777-7841

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*U.S. Government Printing Office : 1983 - 381-934/5166